

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/941,383 | 08/28/2001 | Dana C. Bookbinder | SP01-243 / 9272-7 | 6010 |
| 20792 73 | 590 01/19/2005 | EXAMINER | | |
| MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC | | | HOFFMANN, JOHN M | |
| PO BOX 37428 | 3 | | | |
| RALEIGH, NC 27627 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| • | | | 1731 | |
| | | | | |

DATE MAILED: 01/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|--|--|---------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Office Action Commons | 09/941,383 | BOOKBINDER ET AL. | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | John Hoffmann | 1731 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>21 December 2004</u> . | | | | | | |
| 2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□ This | This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final. | | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowan | 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12,38-43,47 and 48</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | | | | |
| | 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | |
| -6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12, 38-43 and 47-48</u> is/are rejected. | Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on 15 January 2003 and 21 | December 2003 is/are: a)⊠ ac | cepted or b) objected to by the | | | | |
| Examiner. | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | | |
| 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | |
| 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: | | | | | | |
| 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | | | | |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage | | | | | | |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | | | | | | |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) Interview Summary (| | | | | |
| 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | Paper No(s)/Mail Dat 5) | | | | | |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other: | | | | | | |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-12, 38-43 and 47-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2000-44269 in view of Drouart, Kaiser, Ryoji, Gilbreath, Haney and Collins.

See how the art was previously applied in the rejection of 9/20/2004.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 21 December 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

It is argued that the rejection "states that it would be obvious to replace the Oring system of Koaizawa with the sealing washer of Ryoji. This is simply not true. The rejection does not specify any specific washer nor the replacement of a "system". See the rejection for what the Office held to be obvious and why.

It is further argued that O-rings and sealing washers are not equivalents. The rejection provides evidence which proves they are equivalents. Applicant merely alleges they are not equivalents with neither evidence nor rationale as to why they are not equivalents. Nor is there any discussion as to any problem with the Office's evidence which proves they are equivalents.

It is further argued that it should be recognized that the intended function of Koaizawa would be destroyed. This is another allegation with no evidence or rationale to support it.

If Applicant is suggesting that one could not put Ryoji's washer into Koaizawa's apparatus, such is not deemed to be relevant as follows:

From MPEP 2145:

III. ARGUING THAT PRIOR ART DEVICES ARE NOT PHYSICALLY COMBINABLE

"The test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference.... Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of those references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art." In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 425, 208 USPQ 871, 881 (CCPA 1981). See also In re Sneed, 710 F.2d 1544, 1550, 218 USPQ 385, 389 (Fed. Cir. 1983) ("[I]t is not necessary that the inventions of the references be physically combinable to render obvious the invention under review."); and In re Nievelt, 482 F.2d 965, 179 USPQ 224, 226 (CCPA 1973) ("Combining the teachings of references does not involve an ability to combine their specific structures.").

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 1731

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Hoffmann whose telephone number is (571) 272 1191. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 7:00- 3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Griffin can be reached on 571-272-1189. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

John Hoffmann

Primary Examiner

Page 4

Art Unit 17/31

jmh